

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claim Amendments

As in the previous Reply, the Applicant has amended no claims. Applicant respectfully submits no new matter has been added. Accordingly, claims 1-23 are pending in the application.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103 (a)

Claims 1-15 and 17-23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Navin Chaddha (2003/0061368) (Chaddha hereafter) and Siamak Naghian (2004/0102195) (Naghian hereafter). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The present invention aggregates feedback messages regarding distribution characteristics of a data stream to multiple clients in a communication system. In multicasting, a message is sent from a server to a number of users. Every user sends a feedback message and the server might become overloaded when receiving feedback messages from all the clients. In the present invention, an aggregated feedback report, which applies to the feedback messages from a number of clients, is generated and the report is sent to the server providing the data stream and the server uses the report to adapt the transmission of the data. The point is not the provision of the distribution characteristics, but the aggregation of feedback messages being sent from the users.

The Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to claim 1:

1. A method for adapting multi-user multimedia data in a communication system with a server providing the multi-user multimedia data to clients, comprising the steps of:
providing information on distribution characteristics between the server and the clients;
sending a data stream containing the multi-user multimedia data from the server to the clients;
determining the distribution characteristics associated with the clients;
generating an aggregated feedback report on the clients' reception conditions of the data stream considering the distribution characteristics,
wherein said feedback report includes information about aggregation fashion;

sending the aggregated feedback report to the server; and
adapting the transmission of the data stream from the server to the
clients according to the aggregated feedback report. (emphasis added)

The Applicant respectfully submits that the Chaddha and Naghian references do not, individually or in combination disclose all the limitations of claim 1.

In the present state of the art, in the case of multicasting a message, a message is sent from a server to a number of users. Every user sends a feedback message; the Applicant's present invention helps reduce the potential that the server might be overloaded when receiving feedback messages from all the clients.

The Chaddha reference states that "the server streams the multimedia data... via a multicast group address...the client computers provide feedback about the usage and or/need for the multimedia data to the server." Chaddha specifically discloses that every client (computer) sends a feed back message and, once again, that Applicant submits that no aggregation of the feedback messages is disclosed in the Chaddha reference.

The Naghian reference discloses broadcasting, especially where Naghian concentrates on a provision of location information of the users to whom information is to be broadcast. A broadcast transmission is distributed to end users (TV, radio, etc.) without any feedback channel. The cited portion of Naghian discusses tariff rates according to a geographical area. In this portion of Naghian distribution characteristics are not determined. Neither does the Naghian reference discuss or disclose the generation of an aggregated feed back report on clients' distribution characteristics of the data stream.

Therefore, the Chaddha and Naghian references fail to disclose at least the limitations regarding generating and sending to the server an aggregated feedback report regarding multiple clients' distribution characteristics. This being the case, the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claim 1. Claim 20 is analogous to claim 1 and contains similar limitations and the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claim 20.

Claims 2-14, 17-19 and 21-23 depend from claims 1 and 20 respectively and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claims 1 and 20. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-15 and 17-23 is respectfully requested.

Claim 16 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chaddha (2003/0061368) and Naghian (2004/0102195) in view of Zhu et al (5,768,527) (Zhu hereafter). The Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims.

The Zhu reference is cited for providing a fraction of lost packets by the intermediate node depending on conditions of delivery. The Applicant submits, as discussed above, that the Chaddha and Naghian references lack the limitations regarding the aggregation of packets from client computers to send to the server and Zhu, when added to the mix, does not make up the difference. The Applicant respectfully submits that Zhu does not supply the limitations that are lacking in the Chaddha and Naghian references. So, claim 16 recites further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1 and the Applicant respectfully requests the allowance of claim 16.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



By Sidney L. Weatherford
Registration No. 45,602

Date: October 5, 2009

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-8656
sidney.weatherford@ericsson.com